

collected better through counsel; and (3) “it is better to have an attorney regardless of how well a person know[s] the law.” (ECF No. 63 at 1).

In its prior Memorandum and Order, the Court found that this action appears to involve “straightforward questions of fact rather than complex issues of law,” and that Plaintiff appears to be able to clearly present and investigate his claims. See ECF No. 8 at 7. The Court has reviewed the instant motion and finds circumstances have not materially changed since the Court denied Plaintiff’s first request for appointment of counsel. Plaintiff continues to file articulate and readily understood filings with appropriate organization of content. Plaintiff also appears to have a good grasp of the facts of his claims. As for discovery, there is nothing in Plaintiff’s motion to suggest that he is unable to obtain the written discovery he needs through the applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court finds the appointment of counsel is not necessary at this time.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Second Motion for Appointment of Counsel, is **DENIED**. (ECF No. 63)



RONNIE L. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 5th day of April, 2022.